UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,563	04/15/2004	Udo Arend	09334.0012-00	9128

22852   7590   07/09/2008
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
VU, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 March 2008_.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 03/21/2008.

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. In the Amendment, claims 1 and 14 were

amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messinger et

al. ("Messinger", U.S. Pat. No. 7,000,178) and Bartz et al. ("Bartz", U.S. Pat. No. 7,080,327).

Per claim 1, Messinger teaches a user interface for guiding a user through a task requiring

user interaction in a plurality of ordered steps, the user interface including a window on a

computer screen comprising:

a first pane displaying an active roadmap of two or more of the ordered steps of a

particular task and for indicating a selected one of the two or more ordered steps of a particular

task (fig. 13A; first pane 400; col. 5, lines 55-67; col. 10, lines 8-12; *i.e. selected step 1 of

ordered steps (step 1 – step n) of a particular Smurf Detection task)*;

a second pane for providing a user interface pattern, the user interface pattern

corresponding to the selected one of the two or more ordered steps of the particular task (fig.

13A; second pane 43 corresponds to steps 400); and

a third pane for displaying one or more activities related to activities displayed in the user

interface pattern (fig. 13A; *display area 50 related to a task 42b*).

Messinger does not teach wherein at least one step not previously performed and not

immediately following the selected step in the ordered steps is selectable by a user. However,

Bartz teaches wherein at least one step not previously performed and not immediately following

the selected step in the ordered steps is selectable by a user (figs. 3 with steps 310 to 360 and 4A-

4D; col. 7, lines 7- 35; col. 8, line 51- col. 9, line 3, and col. 9, lines 11-17; *user can move from*

the Debugger subsystem back to the Device Editor subsystem without having to pass through the

Application Editor subsystem). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Bartz in the invention of Messinger

in order to allow a user in order to provide the user a greater flexibility and freedom of

movement, but the user is still provided with a degree of organization and guidance.

Per claim 2, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the

user interface pattern is a form (Messinger, fig. 13A; form 50; col. 10, lines 13-22 and lines 50-

67).

Per claim 3, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 2, wherein the

second pane is also for receiving user input into the form (Messinger fig. 13A; form 50; col. 10,

lines 13-22 and lines 50-67).

Per claim 4, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the

first pane is also for receiving a user election of one of the two or more sequential steps

(Messinger col. 6, lines 20-24; col. 10, lines 7-12; *selection of a task provides provide two or*

more sequential steps).

Per claim 5, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the

third pane is also for receiving a user selection of one of the one or more related actions

(Messinger, fig. 13A; col. 10, lines 13-22 and lines 50-67.

Per claim 6, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 5, wherein the

user interface initiates the associated secondary, related task upon receiving the user selection of

one of the one or more related actions (Messinger, col. 10, lines 23-33; *graphical overlay 401c).*

Per claim 7, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the

one or more related actions displayed is based on the indicated sequential step from the first pane

(Messinger, col. 6, lines 20-24; col. 10, lines 7-12; *selection of a task provides provide two or*

more sequential steps).

Per claim 8, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 1, further

comprising a fourth pane displaying explanatory text (Messinger, col. 7, lines 43-52).

Per claim 9, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 8, wherein the

explanatory text displayed is based on the indicated sequential step from the first pane

(Messinger, col. 7, lines 43-52; col. 10, lines 23-33).

Per claim 10, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 1, further

comprising a fifth pane displaying core functions (Messinger, fig. 13C; user privilege 440; col.

12, lines 28-41; *the task list 43 are only displayed based on the level of user's privileges).*

Per claim 11, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 10, wherein the

core function displayed is based on the indicated sequential step from the first pane (Messinger,

col. 10, lines 1-12).

Per claim 12, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 10, wherein one

of the core functions is a command to proceed to the next sequential step (Messinger, col. 10,

lines 44-67).

Per claim 13, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 10, wherein,

upon receipt of the next sequential step command from the user in the fifth pane, the first pane

indicates the next sequential step (Messinger, col. 10, lines 44-67).

Claims 14-24 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1-11 respectively.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments in the Amendment have been fully considered but are not

persuasive.

Applicant's primary argument is that "nowhere in Bartz is it shown or suggested that <u>two

or more of the ordered steps of a particular task.</u>" (Page 7 of applicant's remark)

The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re

Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In this case, Messinger teaches two or more of the ordered steps of a particular task. In

Fig. 13A, Messinger teaches ordered steps, step 1 – step n, of a particular Smurf Detection task,

see col. 5, lines 55-67; col. 10, lines 8-12.

In addition, Bartz teaches at least one step not previously performed and not immediately

following a selected step in ordered steps is selectable by a user. In figs. 3, steps 310-360 of a

process 300, col. 7, lines 3-14, and col. 8, line 64—col. 9, line 3, Bartz shows that user can move

from the Debugger subsystem (i.e . a step) back to the Device Editor subsystem (i.e. a step)

without having to pass through the Application Editor subsystem (a step), and these subsystems

or steps are displayed in order of graphical element A, B and C used to suggest to the user the

order in which the subsystems are to be accessed, see col. 9, lines 11-17.

Accordingly, the combination of Messinger and Bartz teaches the limitations of "a first

pane displaying an active roadmap of two or more of the ordered steps of a particular task and

for indicating a selected one of the two or more ordered steps, wherein at least one step not

previously performed and not immediately following the selected step in the ordered steps of the

particular task is selectable by a user" as recited in claim 1 and 14.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THANH T. VU whose telephone number is (571)272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri 7:00 AM - 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William L. Bashore can be reached on (571) 272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thanh T. Vu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2175